DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 155 355 08 CE 016 500

AUTHOR Boyd, H. Alton
TITLE The Southeast Curriculum Coordination Center: Evaluation of Accomplishments and Review of Procedures.
INSTITUTION Human Resources Research Organization, Pensacola, Fla.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.; Southeast Curriculum Coordination Center, State College, Miss.
REPORT NO FR-CD(P)-75-5
PUB DATE Jul 75
NOTE 78p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Career Education; *Curriculum Development; Curriculum Planning; Curriculum Research; Federal Aid; Program Administration; *Program Coordination; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; *Regional Laboratories; Regional Programs; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS *Southeast Curriculum Coordination Center

ABSTRACT

This third-party evaluation of the activities of the Southeast Curriculum Coordination Center (SCCC) focuses on activities under the original grant (July 1972 to December 1973) which was designed to provide grade level and subject matter expertise for vocational-technical curriculum development with emphasis on career education. Also included is descriptive information on activities under the second (current) grant which emphasizes provision of leadership in the development of curricula for new and changing occupations and dissemination of existing curriculum materials. Section I provides background on the national network for curriculum coordination in vocational-technical education, in which SCCC is one of seven regional centers. Section II presents the original SCCC mission and realignment of objectives, and states the purposes of the present evaluation. Also presented in this section are the approach and procedures used for evaluation, the construction of structured interviews for state liaison representatives (SLR) and state directors, and data collection procedures. Section III presents the results of the original grant evaluation in terms of each of the six grant objectives, noting SCCC's most important accomplishment (regional coordination and communication), and commenting on the adequacy of accomplishment of objectives. A critical review of SCCC operational procedures for the current grant is followed by conclusions and recommendations. The SLR interview guide and curriculum status report forms are appended. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED155355

FR-CD(P) 75-5

THE SOUTHEAST CURRICULUM COORDINATION CENTER: EVALUATION OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND REVIEW OF PROCEDURES

H. Alton Boyd

Prepared for:

Southeast Curriculum Coordination Center
Mississippi State University
State College, Mississippi 39762

July 1975

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HumRRO
HUMAN RESOURCES RESEARCH ORGANIZATION
Central Division--Pensacola Office
400 Plaza Building
Pensacola, Florida 32505

CE 016 305

PREFACE

This report is a third-party evaluation of the activities of the Southeast Curriculum Coordination Center (SCCC) pursuant to a U. S. Office of Education (USOE) grant.

The evaluation was performed by the Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO), under contract with the Mississippi State University (MSU), Starkville, Mississippi, administrator of the USOE grant. HumRRO is a non-profit research and development corporation, whose general purpose is to improve human performance through behavioral and social science research, development, and consultation.

The evaluation covers SCCC activities funded by USOE from July 1, 1972, to December 31, 1974. In addition, a review of current SCCC procedures and activities, covering the period from January 1, 1975, to June 30, 1975, is included in the report. The review of current procedures is not evaluative in nature, but descriptive. It was performed for the purpose of providing an information base for SCCC administrative decisions concerning alternative strategies in the future accomplishment of the SCCC's mission. Data included in the present report were collected in June and July, 1975.

The SCCC Project Director is Dr. James E. Wall, Associate Dean (R&D, College of Education), MSU. The HumRRO project director in this evaluation was Mr. H. Alton Boyd, of the HumRRO Central Division's Dothan, Alabama, Office.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The evaluator wishes to thank a number of people for their time, the material they provided in interviews, by phone, and through the mail--and for their advice and recommendations concerning this effort. Their information and observations will be of use in increasing the extent to which the Southeast Curriculum Coordination Center accomplishes its objectives. These persons include: Dr. Mary Marks, Director, Curriculum Center for Occupational and Adult Education, U. S. Office of Education; Dr. Russell Clark, Assistant State Superintendent, Adult and Vocational Education, Georgia; Dr. T. L. Faulkner, State Director of Vocational Education, Alabama; Mr. W. M. Harrison, Assistant Commissioner of Education, Tennessee; Dr. Carl Lamar, State Director of Vocational Education, Kentucky; Mr. C. M. Lawrence, Assistant State Director of Vocational Education, Florida; Dr. Joe W. Lewis, Director, Division of Vocational and Technical Education, Mississippi; and Mr. Luther Lewis, State Director of Vocational Education, South Carolina, and Mr. William Pinson, Director of Ancillary Services, South Carolina.

State Liaison Representatives provided the most detailed information. Their thoughtful answers were clearly indicative of their personal interest in the Center's effective operation. Appreciation is extended to the following State Liaison Representatives: Dr. Herbert Bruce, Director, Curriculum Development Center, Kentucky; Dr. John Deloney, Director, Curriculum Projects and EPDA, and Executive Director, Alabama Post-Secondary 1202 Commission; Dr. Ken M. Eaddy, Chief, Bureau of Vocational Research, Dissemination, and Evaluation, Division of Vocational Education, Florida, and Dr. John Crittenden, Curriculum Coordinator, who is replacing Dr. Eaddy as Florida's State Liaison Representative; Dr. Arthur K. Jensen, Director, Media Center and Curriculum Laboratory, South Carolina; Ms. Meg Murphy, Chief, Curriculum Design and

Evaluation, Division of Occupational Education, North Carolina, and Mr. Murray Phillips, Consultant in Curriculum Development, North Carolina; Mr. John F. Perry, Assistant Project Director for Southeast Curriculum Coordination Center, Mississippi; Mr. Paul Scott, Director, Occupational Research Coordinating Unit, State Department of Education, Georgia; and Miss Mabel Yates, Director of Research and Curriculum Unit, Division of Vocation Education, Tennessee.

For the many hours spent with the following people and their record files on the campus of Mississippi State Univeristy, Starkville, Mississippi, special thanks to: Mr. John Perry, who serves not only as Mississippi's State Liaison Representative, but as Assistant Project Director and Instructional Materials Specialist; Ms. Charlene Callaway, Office Manager; Dr. James Shill, Co-Director of the original grant work, and presently Research/Curriculum Unit Director; and, especially, Dr. James E. Wall, Associate Dean (R&D, College of Education), Director of the Southeast Curriculum Coordination Center, and formerly Director of the Research/Curriculum Unit, Mississippi State University. Dr. Wall was patient with the interviewer, exhaustive in his responses, and objective in his reporting of the Center's activities--including both its full successes and not-so-full successes.

A special note of appreciation also goes to Dr. Howard Fortney, Education Professionals Development Administration Coordinator, State Department of Vocational Education, Alabama, for his consultative assistance.

Numerous other people were queried about their roles in Center activities: curriculum specialists/developers, curriculum/area supervisors, librarians and vocational education teachers. Even the respondents who thought they did not know enough to answer questions about the Center or about the availability of curriculum materials/information provided useful data on the relative success of the Center's efforts to make its services known to all strata of the vocational-technical/career education community.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section		Page
I.	BACKGROUND	1
	NEED FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION COORDINATION	1
	FORMATION OF THE NATIONAL NETWORK	2
	THE MISSISSIPPI CURRICULUM MANAGEMENT CENTER	4
	REGIONALIZATION	6
	THE SECOND GRANT	6
II.	PROBLEM AND APPROACH	8
	PROBLEM	8
	Original SCCC Mission and Realignment of Objectives	8
	Purposes of the Present Evaluation	9
	APPROACH	10
	General Procedure	10
	Construction of Structured Interviews	11
	Data Collection: Original Grant	12
	Data Collection: Current Grant	12
III.	RESULTS	14
	ORIGINAL GRANT	14
	Objective No. 1	14
	Objective No. 2	20
	Objective No. 3	22
	Objective No. 4	25
	Objective No. 5	26
	Objective No. 6	29

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(Continued)

Section		Page
	SCCC's Most Important Accomplishment	34
	Adequacy of Accomplishment of Objectives	35
	CURRENT GRANT: CRITICAL REVIEW OF SCCC OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES	36
	Summary of SLR Responses	36
	Summary of Comments of State Directors of Vocational Education	54
IV.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	56
	CONCLUSIONS	57
	RECOMMENDATIONS	59
	The SCCC	59
	SLRs	61
	Dissemination	62
	Diffusion	62
	Meetings	62
	Minutes/Reports	63
	Evaluation	63
APPENDICES		
A	INTERVIEW GUIDE: STATE LIAISON REPRESENTATIVES (SLRs)	66
B	CURRICULUM STATUS REPORT FORMS	
	Announcement of Instructional Materials in Progress	69
	Announcement of Release of Instructional Materials	70
TABLES		
1	Original Objectives: SLR Assessment of Adequacy of Accomplishment	35
2	Current Objectives: SLR Assessment of Adequacy of Accomplishment	51

I. BACKGROUND

NEED FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION COORDINATION

Historically, the planning and coordination of the process of vocational-technical curriculum development in the United States has suffered from what might be characterized as an unsystematic approach to the processes of needs assessment, priority arrangement, curriculum development, dissemination, diffusion,[1] and evaluation. In some instances, there has been duplication of effort, resulting in inefficient use of the limited resources available. In others, gaps in the curriculum development process have led to implementation of new curricula which were less than fully satisfactory. Because of these and other problems, a series of advisory councils on vocational education recommended that the U. S. Office of Education (USOE) act to coordinate curriculum development.

At the same time, career education was receiving increasing emphasis, and numerous school districts throughout the nation were seeking both conceptual and financial assistance. Good quality curriculum materials were in short supply, as was teacher training assistance needed to aid in the implementation of career education programs.

Accordingly, in November and December of 1971, USOE began working with state vocational-technical education representatives to formulate plans for the development of regional curriculum laboratories for career education. Requests

---

[1] The terms *dissemination* and *diffusion* as used in this report refer, respectively, to: (1) the process of distributing vocational-technical/career education curriculum materials or information about those materials to target individuals or audiences, and (2) the process of adaptation or adoption of those materials for utilization in effecting desired student behaviors.

for Proposals were issued relating to the establishment of state-based Curriculum Management Centers which were to become the nucleus of a national network for the coordination of career education curriculum development and delivery. More than 50 proposals from 32 states were submitted, out of which USOE selected 5 states' proposals for implementation: California, Illinois, Kentucky, Oklahoma, and Mississippi. In late June, 1972, under Part I, Curriculum Development, Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, each of these five states was awarded a grant in the amount of $180,000 for the purposes of: (1) improving the capabilities of state curriculum laboratories to operate as Curriculum Management Centers; (2) reorienting their efforts toward curriculum development and management in career education (with major emphasis still being given curricula in vocational-technical education, but in the context of career education); and (3) bringing together neighboring states in an effort to engender regionally coordinated activities related to vocational-technical/ career education curricula.

FORMATION OF THE NATIONAL NETWORK

The geographical locations of the five Curriculum Management Centers proved inadequate to provide the intended services for all the United States and its trust territories, so in 1973 USOE established new Centers in the states of New Jersey and Washington. These seven Centers developed into a cohesive National Network for Curriculum Coordination in Vocation-Technical Education, with a National Council composed of the Director, Curriculum Center for Occupational and Adult Education, USOE, and the Center Directors.

At an early meeting of the National Council, the Network's primary goal was identified: "To maximize the national resources for curriculum development and coordination in vocational-technical education in the context of career

education." Objectives in support of that goal also were established.

Objective 1: Share information among and between states and regions regarding curriculum materials which are available and/or under development.

Objective 2: Develop and recommend guidelines for curricula and curriculum development with the ultimate objectives of:

- increasing the effectiveness of curriculum materials as tools for improvement of teacher-learning activities
- enhancing the transportability of curriculum materials

Objective 3: Establish and maintain a system for determining curriculum needs in vocational-technical education and for reporting conclusions to the field.

Objective 4: Coordinate curriculum development, dissemination and diffusion among and between states and regions, in order to:

- avoid unwarranted duplication of effort
- enhance quality of effort
- enhance transportability of curriculum materials
- improve use and acceptance of curriculum materials

Objective 5: Report to the field of vocational-technical education the results of the first year's curriculum coordination efforts.

Although the initial 1972 grants were largely for planning/organizing purposes, a great deal of development was also accomplished. The National Network came to function effectively as a nation-wide entity, and materials were developed which publicized and explained its work. Priorities were set, based on information developed through the Centers at both the local and state levels. Each Center was able to establish itself in its region as a collector and disseminator of relevant vocational information with the states in its

region and with other Centers. Further, each Center gained experience in employing widely varying strategies and approaches to meet the needs of the states it served and to accomplish its overall objectives.

THE MISSISSIPPI CURRICULUM MANAGEMENT CENTER

Mississippi's proposal had requested $433,782. Like the other states selected, Mississippi was awarded only $180,000 for an 18-month period, from July 1, 1972, to December 31, 1973. (Subsequently, in an attempt to preserve continuity of effort, the Center requested, and was granted, two no-cost extensions of the grant period, each for six months. These extensions, which allowed the project to be considered "continuing," permitted the uninterrupted progress of Center activities using unspent original grant funds, and carried the project up to the beginning of a new grant period. In addition, USOE allowed a period of time after January 1, 1975, for unused original grant funds to be spent for printing USOE-developed curriculum materials and on project evaluation activities. The present report is a part of that evaluation activity.)

The mission of the new Mississippi Curriculum Management Center was parallel to that of the ongoing Mississippi State Curriculum Coordinating Unit (CCU) and Research Coordinating Unit (RCU), that is, to develop curriculum materials for vocational-technical education programs. The Center was intended to augment existing staffs of those units in order to provide additional expertise in grade level and subject matter areas, with the goal of increasing emphasis on career education, particularly at the awareness, exploratory, pre-vocational, and preparation (vocational-technical) levels.

The specific objectives of the original Mississippi proposal were:

1. To further develop an existing administrative organization and structure for coordination of career education curriculum research, development, diffusion, and evaluation.

2. To conduct curriculum development activities which focus on the articulation of career education concepts with other apsects of education.

3. To expand CCU-RCU physical capabilities for the development and production of career education curriculum components.

4. To utilize appropriate curriculum development systems and information systems which will further career education curriculum development activities.

5. To expand the capabilities of the CCU-RCU so that inservice training of educational personnel can be focused on adoption and utilization of curriculum programs and materials.

6. To develop and maintain coordinative interaction with other agencies which have as their prime function that of career education curriculum development.

It should be noted that these original objectives were retained, despite the award of less than half the requested funds. This contributed to a need to realign the objectives as the project progressed.

Housed at Mississippi State University, the Mississippi Curriculum Management Center (now called the Southeast Curriculum Coordination Center and hereinafter referred to as the SCCC or the Center) is a part of both the State Division of Vocational-Technical Education and the University, and operates within their policies. These two organizations have materially aided the Center in the conduct of its functions, and there is strong evidence that they are both committed to the Center's improvement and success.

The first group of states associated with the SCCC included North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Louisiana, and Mississippi. In an effort to realign along USOE regional lines, Louisiana joined another group of states, and Kentucky and Tennessee joined the SCCC, making its area coincident with USOE Region IV.

REGIONALIZATION

Early in the grant period, the emphasis of USOE, the National Network, SCCC and State Department priorities shifted from career educaton to vocational-technical education, and from development of career education curriculum materials to their dissemination. In addition, emphasis was increased on the process of regionalizing[1] the coordination of information on curriculum materials. A priority effort from the outset, the coordination of curriculum development was intended not only to assist in setting appropriate curriculum priorities, but also to avoid wasteful and unwarranted duplication of developmental work. USOE and the National Network agreed that it was critical to enlightened decision-making that states be made aware of what career education curriculum materials had been developed, were in the process of being developed, were being planned, and by whom.

THE SECOND GRANT

A second grant was awarded to SCCC to continue and expand the work already under way. The project proposal for the second grant requested $40,000 per year for two years. USOE granted an award for the first year in the amount of $35,719, with an effective date of January 29, 1975. Most of the funds are earmarked for travel expenses for State Liaison Representatives (SLRs) who attend SCCC-scheduled meetings. Some funds will be applied to SCCC salaries,

---

[1] An addendum to the original grant specified that, "As a part of the work agreed to under this grant, the Mississippi State Curriculum Laboratory will begin to regionalize its services." It was intended that all the Centers would provide leadership in bringing neighboring states together to share information and plans regarding curriculum development in progress, completed, and planned, as well as ways of providing for testing, dissemination, and diffusion. It was hoped they could foster the cooperation necessary for sharing the full range of curriculum development activities--from needs assessment to diffusion.

supplies, printing, communication, and dissemination expenses.

The primary mission of the SCCC under this current grant is to provide leadership in the development of curricula for new and changing occupations and to coordinate improvements in and dissemination of existing curriculum materials in the USOE Region IV area. To accomplish this mission, the goal is to expand further the services of the SCCC through the accomplishment of the following specific objectives:

Objective No. 1: To promote the development and dissemination of vocational-technical curriculum materials for use in teaching occupational subjects, including curriculums for new and changing occupational fields and including those in public service.

Objective No. 2: To develop standards for curriculum development in all occupational fields.

Objective No. 3: To coordinate efforts of the states in the preparation of curriculum materials and also in the preparation of current lists of curriculum materials available in all occupational fields.

Objective No. 4: To survey curriculum materials produced by other agencies of the Government, including the Department of Defense.

Objective No. 5: To evaluate vocational-technical education curriculum materials and their uses.

Objective No. 6: To train personnel in curriculum development.

The present report presents an evaluation of the activities of the Center under the original grant in its attempts to achieve the six specific objectives described. It also presents descriptive information concerning the activities of the Center under the second, or current, grant. The report is organized into four sections, entitled: I. Background (the present section); II. Problem and Approach; III. Results; and IV. Conclusions and Recommendations. In the sections dealing with problem, approach, results, and conclusions, there are subdivisions dealing with evaluation of the original grant activities and with descriptions of current grant activities.

II. PROBLEM AND APPROACH

PROBLEM

A need exists to coordinate all aspects of vocational-technical/career education in USOE Region IV. The present evaluation seeks to determine the extent to which this need is being met through the work of the SCCC. An additional purpose is to provide management data which enable personnel involved in SCCC activities to plan, monitor, redirect, and measure more effectively their efforts to deliver SCCC services.

Original SCCC Mission and Realignment of Objectives

The SCCC's mission originally was to expand existing curriculum laboratory activities, augment staffing of existing agencies, increase the emphasis placed on career education, and regionalize curriculum coordination. This mission was in support of the goal of the National Network for Curriculum Coordination in Vocational-Technical Education to maximize national resources for curriculum development and to coordinate vocational-technical education in the context of career education. The specific objectives of the Center in carrying out its mission were listed in the preceding section of this report.

The objectives of the original SCCC proposal were conceptualized prior to the formation of the National Network. Consequently, some adjustments in those objectives were appropriate as a result of alignment of national and regional priorities. As a result of this new alignment, career education was de-emphasized in favor of vocational-technical education, and curriculum development was de-emphasized (due to the cost of the process) in favor of dissemination of existing and in-development curricula. Regionalization also received increased emphasis as a result of the realignment.

During SCCC work under the original grant (1972-1974), the Center was changing. Its mission was, to some degree, in a state of flux. Federal influence was evolving, as were influences within the Center itself and within the states it was intended to serve.

SCCC administrators and staff were working out a structure compatible with the accomplishment of the member states' objectives as well as those of the National Network. The flexible, changing nature of the SCCC allowed consideration of new and emerging needs and priorities. Therefore, the objectives of the Center may be viewed as guidelines for the achievement of a mixture of the original and newly evolved purposes that resulted from change in the Center's capabilities and the influences of its sponsors and members.

Purposes of the Present Evaluation

The present evaluation effort has two major thrusts. The first is to collect information which bears on the SCCC's accomplishment of the original grant objectives. The second is to determine the implications of past and current efforts for planning strategies to enhance the accomplishment of SCCC objectives in the future. This second objective involves a critical review of the operational procedures of the SCCC under the current grant.

The specific objectives of the current grant coincide with six of eight Fiscal Year 1975 operational objectives for Part I funding suggested by the Curriculum Development Branch of the Division of Vocational Education Research, Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education, USOE. Despite the relatively more performance-oriented statement of the current objectives, as opposed to the objectives of the original grant, quantifiable data related to them were not easily found. It is noted that SLRs uniformly were aware of the need for more quantifiable data to allow evaluation of the degree and manner in which grant objectives were being met.

APPROACH

Responsiveness to the needs of the emerging Region IV organization required flexibility in the Center's programmatic alternatives. In general, as needs were identified and opportunities to further the Center's goals presented themselves, they were acted upon within the general framework of guidelines and stated objectives, but with the necessary degree of flexibility. Such an approach allowed planned, guided progress simultaneously with innovative progress.

The paucity of quantitative data on which to base an evaluation was evident from the outset. Clear-cut comparisons of outcome, or product, data with baseline data simply are not possible. On the other hand, data and evidence of progress toward the intended state of affairs--as implied in the original mission statements and objectives--do allow statements regarding reduction of the discrepancy between the intended state and that which existed when the project began.

General Procedure

In a series of consultations between the SCCC staff and the evaluator, it was decided to (1) examine the original grant work to determine the nature of the processes involved in SCCC activities and to estimate the extent to which grant objectives had been accomplished, and (2) make a critical review of the current operational procedures in order to allow SCCC evaluation of the current status of those procedures and of alternative procedures. It was agreed that, because of the nature of the objectives, in-depth interviews with selected persons would be the most appropriate method of conducting the evaluation.

In evaluating activities under the original grant, a probing interview was used with the Center staff to collect data. The interview was oriented toward the original grant objectives themselves. In-depth probing was used to obtain as much information as possible on mission/objective accomplishment. An important

additional source of information utilized during the evaluation was the Center's letter files, minutes of meetings, Quarterly Progress Reports, and other records. While some additional data on original grant activities was obtained from SLRs and other personnel, the bulk of the data was supplied by the SCCC staff.

The review of current grant procedures also was conducted by interview. However, rather than the less structured, probing interview, a structured interview was used. Respondents were SLRs, State Directors of Vocational Education, and other available people whose jobs relate to SCCC activities, e.g., State Department of Vocational Education staff, curriculum laboratory staff, and vocational-technical/career education teachers and supervisors. SLRs have had, and are expected to continue to have, more experience with the SCCC than any other category of people, so it was decided to concentrate on that group as the main source of data. While the principal focus of this interview was on current grant activities of the Center, it also dealt with the Center's activities and accomplishments under the original grant.

Construction of Structured Interviews

The framework for the structured interviews for use with SLRs and State Directors (SDs) was based on detailed discussions with three SLRs and the SCCC Project Director. The initial format and content of the interviews were pretested with a vocational-technical/career education consultant who was conversant with SCCC operations. The interview was revised on the basis of his recommendations and then reviewed and approved by the SCCC Project Director.

The SLR interviews were intended to produce data which described the respondents themselves; the manner in which they disseminated materials from the Center; SCCC program impact for their states; their opinions on current procedures, meetings, staffing, communications, a newsletter, and SCCC continuity; and their

assessments of the adequacy of accomplishment of the SCCC objectives under both the original and current grants.

Data Collection: Original Grant

Four days were spent in a series of interviews with SCCC personnel and files/records searches at the Center. These activities focused on the mission objectives of the original Mississippi proposal. The interviewees were the State Director of Vocational and Technical Education and members of his staff, the SCCC Project Director, Assistant Project Director, Office Manager, curriculum specialists, librarian, and secretary. The Assistant Project Director interviewed was the second person to hold this position, the original Assistant having taken other employment during the first grant period.

In addition to the documents contained in the project files which were examined, the USOE Project Monitor provided other documents related to the evaluation effort. These documents also were reviewed during this phase of the work.

As noted, information about the original grant work was also supplied by SLRs and SDs throughout Region IV in subsequent interviews. SLRs were asked a number of questions pertaining to the original grant. They also were asked to rate the adequacy of accomplishment, on a 5-point scale, of each of the original objectives. The interview questions and the rating scale are shown in the Interview Guide (Appendix A).

Data Collection: Current Grant

During discussions prior to design of the interview questions, it became obvious that, while tracing the exact routes of most materials disseminated through the SCCC would be extremely difficult, it would be even more difficult to determine which materials had been adopted at local levels. Consequently, it was determined that data collection should stress information dissemination

rather than its diffusion into the vocational education system.[1] Accordingly, the evaluation focused more on dissemination than diffusion, but sufficient attention was given to diffusion so that informed decisions could be made about the Center's future role in diffusion.

At the May, 1975, SCCC quarterly meeting in Atlanta, attendees were informed of the evaluation/review and of the proposed visits by the evaluator to their office locations. Subsequently, appointments were made with each of the SLRs and available SDs for interview visits.

All eight Region IV SLRs were interviewed, as were six of the eight SDs. One SD was on annual leave during the evaluator's visit; another was away on a business trip. In the latter case, the Assistant State Director was interviewed. The interviews were conducted during June-July, 1975.

In general, the SLR interview forms were adhered to closely, in the interest of time. Interviews with the SLRs were tape recorded for later analysis. SLR interviews ranged in length from two and one-half hours to six hours. The longer interviews involved more clarifying questions, more descriptions of SCCC-related experiences unique to given SLRs and included information that simply took longer to describe. Because SDs were much less familiar with the details of SCCC activities (typically having left those details to SLRs), their interviews took far less time.

Each of the SLRs rated the adequacy of accomplishment--at that point in time--of each of the specific objectives of the current SCCC grant. As the grant has been in effect only since January 29, 1975, the respondents were asked to make those judgments on the basis of the progress they perceived as having been made up to the time of the interview.

---

[1] The reader is referred to page 1 for discussion of the usage of the terms "dissemination" and "diffusion" in this report.

III. RESULTS

ORIGINAL GRANT

In presenting the results of the evaluation of SCCC activities under the original grant, each of the grant objectives is listed. The objective is followed by a description of the Center activities associated with it, and evaluative comments concerning the effectiveness or adequacy of those activities in meeting the objective are then given.

It should be noted that many activities of the Center could not be associated exclusively with the accomplishment of just one objective. More often than not, an activity cut across several objectives because of the interrelated nature of the objectives. For presentation purposes, most major activities cited are listed under only one of the original objectives, though reference is sometimes made to the relationship of the activity to other objectives. It should also be noted that the activities listed in this section are by no means an exhaustive catalog of the SCCC's activities. Rather, they are presented as representative and illustrative.

In reviewing the various activities related to the six objectives of the original grant, the reader should keep in mind the change in emphasis that occurred during the course of the grant from career education to vocational education. Thus, while five of the six objectives contain explicit reference to career education, much of the Center's activity was actually devoted to vocational education.

Objective No. 1. *To further develop an existing administrative organization and structure for coordination of career education curriculum research, development, diffusion, and evaluation.*

The Center's approach to achievement of this objective involved a number of specific activities and mechanisms. These included staff augmentations and a variety of curriculum reporting activites to the member states, as well as activities on the part of Center personnel to increase their awareness of events outside Region IV.

Staff Augmentation. Salaries of several personnel, hired on the basis of their expertise in areas previously not represented among the Center staff, were partially covered by grant money. Curriculum coordinators, researchers, and personnel associated with materials production and with office and library management were added to the staff. Curriculum coordinators, responsible for curriculum development, worked on in-progress as well as on newly initiated work. For example, one coordinator, hired to work in the Exploration Phase (grades 7, 8, and 9) of a career education effort already underway (Jones County Exemplary Project), authored *Teacher's Edition Occupational Orientation: An Introduction to the World of Work*. It was adopted extensively in Mississippi, and 300 copies were purchased by Alabama, with smaller numbers of copies being purchased by other states.

Production personnel added to the staff were involved extensively in the preparation of camera-ready copy of material developed elsewhere through USOE funding. Center staff prepared the material for duplication and dissemination.

Staff development was provided to the extent possible. Personnel attended various professional meetings and seminars, such as American Vocational Associaton meetings, and actively served on committees of numerous professional groups.

From time to time, graduate students were added to the staff as research assistants in curriculum development and diffusion projects. Such internships

provided on-the-job training and advanced study opportunities in their fields of specialization as well as direct assistance to the Center itself.

Other Region IV Staff Development. Staff development also occurred elsewhere in Region IV. One example is cited here, in which an SLR reported that SCCC meetings and his visits with other Region IV projects were the primary impetus for his staff-building program in which a number of specialists were hired to work in state curriculum projects. As his experience broadened through Center-sponsored activities, he applied that experience in his home state. He now assists State Department staff and teacher educators, for example, in identifying personnel development needs as well as curriculum needs. On the basis of personnel development needs thus identified, his state is now involved in an extensive EPDA-sponsored project to reduce those identified discrepancies through a series of highly developed workshops for teachers, teacher educators, and State Department staff. Further, his report indicated that the closer working relationships thereby engendered between State Department staff and teacher educators has effected better relations and results for those two groups than have existed in many years.

General Information Presentation. Each regional Coordination Center contributed to the professional production of a slide-tape presentation on the mission and accomplishments of the Centers entitled "The Learning Network--the National Network for Curriculum Coordination." A Network Newsletter was compiled and printed by the Mississippi Center. These activities were intended to share information on curriculum activities conducted under the auspices of the National Network and to strengthen communicative ties among the Centers and states. Each SLR was provided a copy of the slide-tape presentation to produce as much awareness of the Network and its mission as possible in each state. Two SLRs have shown the presentation to their State Directors, five have not, and

one is not sure whether the Director has seen it or not. Typically, it has been shown to the SLRs' staffs. Two said they had shown it to State Department staff, and one has used it with teacher educators.

Curriculum Status Report Forms. Standardized forms were developed on which information about curriculum materials in the process of development or completed could be reported to the Center for compilation into listings of curriculum materials or be used otherwise to disseminate that information. The first form developed by the Center staff became obsolete when SLRs cited their need for additional information. Accordingly, a set of forms was developed, primarily by the South Carolina SLR, with inputs from other SLRs and the Project Director. The forms are titled "Announcement of Instructional Materials in Progress" and "Announcement of Release of Instructional Materials," and are considered comprehensive enough for current dissemination objectives. Each form, when properly filled out, allows an individual to make sophisticated, practical dissemination and diffusion decisions about the material described without the necessity of handling the material itself. See Appendix B.

Curriculum Bibliographies. Arrangements were made at the May, 1975, quarterly meeting to provide SLRs with copies of status report forms to enable them to keep the SCCC updated, on a quarterly schedule, of curriculum developments in their states. The Center intends to use the forms to update bibliographies of curriculum materials previously published when Region IV SLRs provided the Center with information on career education materials in-progress and completed. Lists supplied by four of the states were published by the Center and disseminated nation-wide. More than 1,200 copies of these publications titled *Career Education Curriculum Materials* were distributed. Dissemination of these lists resulted in a massive, but unspecified, number of requests for listed materials from states and territories which received the lists. While the

response to the lists was good in one sense--much material was shared far and wide, with the attendant benefits; avoidance of duplication of effort, etc.--there was an unfortunate aspect to the big response which was largely unanticipated. The four states which had "advertised" what they had in curriculum material (North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Mississippi) were subsequently deluged with requests and all were not set up to handle that situation adequately. In some cases they ran out of expensive, much-requested material, and some state policies do not allow sale of the materials, even on a cost-recovery basis. Thus, some of the states found they were then unable to supply the needs within their own state and were unable to replenish their stocks.

States are less likely to submit lists of their materials as long as their publication results in such problems for them. Distributing curriculum materials which may already be in short supply for their own states or trying to recover the cost of the materials through difficult and complicated billing procedures are not likely to foster future coordination efforts.

Curriculum Queries. The Center staff indicated that by the end of the original grant period the Center was handling an average of two or three queries per week from the other Coordination Centers related to vocational-technical/career education curriculum materials. An average of between five and ten queries per week from agencies within the Region IV states was being handled. Information in response to these queries was provided by the Center, or the queries were disseminated to the other Centers or to Region IV SLRs, as appropriate.

Illinois Diffusion Seminar. The National Curriculum Diffusion Seminar at Southern Illinois Univeristy at Carbondale, sponsored by Illinois with Education Professions Development Act (EPDA) funds, was attended by National Network personnel, including SLRs. Subsequent to this seminar there was a noticeable

increase in requests for curriculum materials produced by Region IV states. While the behavior changes effected by the Seminar are not quantifiable, it was the consensus among attendees interviewed that the seminar was especially effective for them personally, having given them a great deal of usable information not encountered before. For example, some respondents stated that they had acquired new behavioral techniques which allowed them to work more effectively with diffusion activities in their states. The joint purpose of the National Network and the SCCC clearly was served well through the seminar. It was especially responsive to the purposes of improving the acceptance and increasing the transportability of curriculum materials. Regional sensitivity to the problems of diffusion was very much increased by the seminar.

Evaluative Comments: Objective No. 1. The Center responded appropriately in its development of the administrative organization with the addition of staff with pertinent skills and to staff development needs by as much participation as possible in seminars, professional meetings, on-the-job training, etc. The Center's coordination of regional curriculum research, development, diffusion, and evaluation was not developed to a high degree at the end of the first grant period, though such coordination was firmly established. It must be pointed out that the groundwork for each of these areas has been laid, as evidenced by the minutes of the quarterly meetings, Quarterly Progress Reports, and the SLR interview material. During the initial grant period, the emphasis was clearly on establishing a good structure for communication and on dissemination activities, with relatively less stress on diffusion. Much less stress was laid on coordinating research and development, although Region IV members are highly sensitive to the necessity for avoiding duplication of effort.

The Center has established regional communication to a high degree, as indicated by the freedom and ease with which SLRs interact and exchange ideas,

principally at the Center's quarterly meetings, but in other contexts as well. Because of USOE guidance, Center staffing, and because it is a foundation for the other aspects of coordination, dissemination has been the Center's major coordinative activity under the initial grant. Regional cooperation has been fostered and is increasing. While the groundwork for effective coordination has been established with member states, it must be developed more deeply and broadly, with more involvement and support of State Directors, to permit the kinds of policy decisions required in each state for thorough coordination.

Objective No. 1 became one of the two top priority objectives of the SCCC (No. 6 was the other) in keeping with guidelines and emerging Network/Center needs. The evaluator's conclusion is that Objective No. 1 was effectively accomplished.

Objective No. 2: *To conduct curriculum development activities which focus on the articulation of career education's concepts with other aspects of education.*

Based on USOE guidelines, and with the agreement of the Center Director, the emphasis on career education was withdrawn in favor of vocational-technical education. Curriculum development was recognized to be too costly to be one of the Center's major thrusts, in view of its funding level, so it was de-emphasized. As a consequence, this objective received much less attention than had been contemplated originally, but some pertinent activities were undertaken.

Exemplary Career Education Project. The Center engaged in projects within the State of Mississippi which related to this objective. A career education project was under way when the grant period began. It was known as the Jones County Exemplary Project, and from it, documents in the areas of Career Awareness, Exploration, Preparation, and Advancement were prepared and widely disseminated and diffused in Mississippi. As noted in the discussion of Objective No. 1,

Alabama purchased 300 of these documents, and smaller numbers were purchased and disseminated by other states. Personnel who worked on the Jones County Project received salaries partially funded by the original grant.

Assistance for Other Career Education Development. Center staff assisted state and local level personnel in various other vocational-technical/career education curriculum development and evaluation programs. Career education materials were compiled and edited, state-level staff were advised and assisted in planning program components, assistance was given in the evaluation of local programs, and local personnel were helped in their selection of Career Exploration and Vocational Guidance materials.

"Start-Up" Training. Pre-employment training programs for workers in new or expanding industries were planned and developed by the Center staff. Such "start-up" programs usually were planned to coincide with the completion of the physical facility where the newly trained workers were to be employed. These programs represented the coordinated efforts of the industry involved, local education agencies, the employment service, the Vocational Division of the State Department of Education, and the Center. While such programs, thus, are not usually the exclusive product of the Center, they do receive a great deal of Center attention, and an active attempt is made to coordinate and disseminate them throughout the region.

Mississippi's "start-up" program provides an example of such activities. By June, 1974, the latest date for which figures are available, curriculum materials had been developed to support training programs for approximately 26 different industries, and more than 30,000 people had been trained[1] and

---

[1] This program existed independently of the SCCC grant, and, while the Center has actively participated, it should not be concluded that this training was a direct product of SCCC activities alone.

subsequently employed in Mississippi in the industries for which they were trained. In Fiscal Year 1974 alone, contacts were made with 61 companies, 18 of which were new to the state, and the other 43 of which represented in-state expansions. That year 8,682 people were trained. Three of the SLRs reported that components of "start-up" programs have been adopted and adapted in their states. No quantitative data were available on the extent of such program exporting, but it does exist and is the type of coordination and cooperation the SCCC seeks to foster.

A different type of reciprocal assistance often is fostered in these endeavors, as it has been in other facets of SCCC/regional interactions. In one instance, a printing industry for which personnel were trained agreed to print, free of charge, 25,000 copies of three curriculum documents the Center wanted for dissemination.

Evaluative Comments: Objective No. 2. In line with guidance and limited funding, curriculum development necessarily was de-emphasized under the grant. Some within-Mississippi work in line with the objective was accomplished, and there was evidence from other SLRs that some dissemination and diffusion had occured within member states. Considering the lowered priority associated with this objective and the work which can be clearly identified with it, it is the evaluator's conclusion that Objective No. 2 was accomplished to the extent possible. However, it cannot be said that the objective was achieved to the extent that was desired for the region.

Objective No. 3: *To expand CCU-RCU physical capabilities for the development and production of career education curriculum components.*

Addition of Production Equipment and Materials. As previously noted, grant money was used to pay part of the salaries of several CCU-RCU personnel who

worked on projects related to the grant's objectives. When grant money was used for salary in lieu of state money, state money was released as "lapsed" salary money. This money, in turn, was applied toward the purchase of duplication equipment and supplies, career education films, and film projectors. Duplication equipment included a collator, perfect binder, Solonar press, folding machine, plate maker, console for varityper, and various supplies, including ink and paper. In one transaction, a discount of 30% was realized because the Center was able to buy a large amount of paper at one time, utilizing such funds.

Evaluative Comments: Objective No. 3. With special recognition of the fiscal management which allowed both staff and equipment to be added to increase the SCCC's capabilities, and in view of the current capacity represented by the personnel and the printing facility available for Center work, it is the evaluator's conclusion that Objective No. 3 was accomplished.

Objective No. 4: *To utilize appropriate curriculum development systems and information systems which will further career education curriculum development activities.*

Proposed Ohio State/MSU Interaction. The major activity originally intended under this objective when the proposal was prepared was greatly increased interaction with the Center for Vocational-Technical Education at Ohio State University. Arrangements had been made with the Ohio Center for the MSU Center to act as data collector and processor in local-level activities on a curriculum development project for which the Ohio Center had submitted a proposal to USOE. A competing proposal won the competition, so the major planned Ohio State/MSU coordinative activities were not accomplished.

Regionalization activities did, nonetheless, develop for the MSU

Center the capabilities it had intended to provide the Ohio Center, namely, to provide a reliable source of problems in curriculum development, a reality-base for evaluating Center objectives and activities, a test, development and/or demonstration site for Center products, and ready access to a growing and important target audience.

Collection of Data for Ohio Center. One Ohio Center/SCCC joint activity consisted of arrangements made by the SCCC staff for the completion of a set of the Ohio Center's questionnaires by appropriate incumbent workers and their supervisors in Mississippi. The Ohio project was aimed at the improvement of the content derivation process in the development of instructional materials.

Staff Interaction with Ohio Center. The Director and staff of the SCCC and personnel of the Ohio Center engaged in extensive interactions in the areas of (1) setting priorities for curriculum development, and (2) problems of dissemination and diffusion. In these interactions, the SCCC Director examined many models of curriculum development. [1] Additionally, the SCCC staff were afforded a wide exposure to the professional field, which enhanced both their skills and their professional contacts.

Information Systems. From its inception, the Center has both recognized and stressed the importance of a systematic reporting system in which pertinent information on curriculum materials could be disseminated throughout the entire Network to appropriate recipients, including personnel at the local level. The SCCC's support of regional development of reporting forms for curriculum

---

[1] The Director's paper, "Validation of Curriculum in Vocational-Technical Education," was a direct result of these interactions with the Ohio Center and was presented to (1) The Institute for Curriculum Personnel Development, sponsored by the Department of Vocational Education, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado, October 26, 1972, and (2) The Institute for Curriculum Personnel Development, Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama.

development (see Appendix B); its functioning as a two-way disseminator of curriculum materials--from the Network to the region, from the region to the Network; and its placement of materials in Abstracts of Instructional Materials/ Abstracts of Research Materials (AIM/ARM) are examples of its utilization and enhancement of information/communication systems to further curriculum coordination.

On numerous occasions, the Center Director has served as consultant on special problems. He consulted in Florida with personnel involved in establishing that state's curriculum laboratory. He and the Center staff also consulted with visitors to MSU from several states when they requested inputs to their efforts to start, and in some cases, further develop, their Centers. Information and innovations provided by the Center staff were utilized in these interactions.

Evaluative Comments: Objective No. 4. Although the major planned interaction with the Ohio Center did not take place, the SCCC's capability to perform the planned work was, in fact, developed independently of that activity. Regionalization was largely responsible for the acquisition of that capability, and, in turn, interactions between the SCCC and the Ohio Center greatly enhanced the SCCC's ability to effect regionalization. In addition, the coordinative and consultative capabilities of the Center and its members were increased in the process.

The establishment of a framework for regional dissemination has been effected. While its current status is cooperative in intent, it is not fully cooperative in operation. There has been less than complete reporting to the SCCC by Region IV states of their materials developed. This has resulted in a less-than-complete input for the dissemination system.

While recognizing the extreme positive importance of the establishment

of the Region IV dissemination system framework itself, it must also be noted that its effectiveness at the end of the initial grant period was far short of that which was desired. In large part, the failure of some states fully to share their materials must be attributed to state funding and sales policy limitations, rather than to lack of desire to cooperate. A broader discussion of factors related to this shortcoming is included in the subsequent section of this report under Critical Review of Current SCCC Procedures. In the evaluator's judgment, Objective No. 4 was only partially accomplished.

Objective No. 5: *To expand the capabilities of the CCU-RCU so that inservice training of educational personnel can be focused on adoption and utilization of curriculum programs and materials.*

In-State Inservice. This objective was originally intended as a continuation and expansion of ongoing programs at the MSU CCU-RCU. The grant did allow additional inservice training of personnel at the MSU facility to be accomplished, but with regionalization, emphasis shifted from training only for Center personnel to inservice for regional personnel.

The SCCC staff participated in a number of projects whose purpose was the upgrading of professional abilities of vocational and career education personnel. They taught in courses and workshops attended by personnel of career education projects in Mississippi. Such courses were concerned with a broad range of the conduct of such projects, from development to evaluation.

Staff Development/Inservice. The following are examples of staff development activities: the Center staff attended the convention of the American Vocational Association, Chicago, Illinois, and the Institute for Curriculum Personnel Development, Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama. The Director participated in a number of planning sessions which led to the formation of

the National Network, then he attended meetings of the Network, Center staff participated in a Pennsylvania State University meeting aimed at curriculum diffusion.

SLR Inservice. Early experience at Region IV quarterly meetings convinced SLRs of the usefulness of meeting in various locations to observe educational projects considered pertinent by host SLRs. In addition to the obvious benefit accruing to the visiting SLRs who would have the opportunity to learn details of the host state's program by viewing it critically in its operational context, the host's program would benefit from the expertise shared through the visitors' questions, comments, and suggestions.

This process of showcasing innovative projects, now virtually institutionalized as a feature of SCCC meetings, has become an integral part of inservice for all members. Their consensus is that it comprises one of the single most valued aspects of affiliation with the Center. Numerous examples of their own behavior change--clustering especially in the area of diffusion activities--were cited by respondents. In general, their comments may be characterized as descriptive in nature, and, while enthusiasm is difficult to assess, it is the evaluator's opinion that the respondents' perceived value of these inservice meetings is especially high.

Some statements were more specific: one SLR cited "good ideas" related to evaluation of career education projects his state had "installed" as a result of his attendance at the Fort Lauderdale, Florida, meeting. Another SLR stated flatly that the overall development of career education materials in his state had been "greatly influenced" by information about the conduct of Exemplary Projects visited by the SCCC quarterly meetings. He said his "confidence" and "leadership" had benefited a great deal from such interactions.

Three inservice events were the subject of most of the respondents'

comments in this area: (1) the quarterly meeting held in Fort Lauderdale, Florida, at which the curriculum development activity of the Broward County Career Education Project was examined in detail; (2) the quarterly meeting held in Raleigh, North Carolina, in which North Carolina's state-wide curriculum demonstration and diffusion project was fully displayed; and (3) the Change Agent Conference held in Atlanta, with EPDA funds, which grew directly out of needs identified at regional quarterly meetings.

Informal Discussions. While it cannot be considered a systematic part of inservice, another feature of scheduled Region IV meetings must be mentioned. The single most-often mentioned aspect of meetings is the useful information picked up and shared at coffee breaks, "bull sessions," and in after-hours discussions. In addition to being mentioned frequently by respondents, it obviously has high positive value for most, if not all, SLRs. Members of the group soon found that, on occasion, unplanned aspects of the quarterly meetings turned out to be the most interesting and useful to them. It is as though priority subjects have a way of emerging, despite what a program agenda calls for. This is not to imply that scheduled topics are less appropriate, but that the apparent intense interest of the participants in their home-state problems and activities makes them especially willing to augment the agenda.

Additional discussion of inservice training and related SLR behavior change is contained in the following section, under SCCC Operational Procedures.

Evaluative Comments: Objective No. 5. The intent of this objective shifted from inservice strictly for CCU-RCU personnel more to inservice for Region IV SLRs and others involved in Center-related work, especially diffusion. It was recognized by virtually everyone, from the USOE Coordinator to most of the SLRs, that the Center iself, given past (and especially present) funding and staffing, could not carry the responsibility for local diffusion throughout

Region IV. Instead, diffusion is popularly seen as the responsibility of the individual states, with assistance provided by the Center in the form of in-service, consulting on specific problems, regional-level coordination of assistance, and perhaps on-site visits by experts identified through Center inquiries.

Accordingly, the focus of this objective has shifted to providing assistance to the SLRs so they can become prime-mover change agents in their own states in diffusion of curriculum materials. At this point, diffusion and advisory groups or agencies charged with diffusion responsibility exist in some, but not all, of the Region IV states. In at least one state, a diffusion plan will be a part of curriculum design and development, so the need for such a group is not anticipated. In other states, the SLRs reported that Center urging had led to the formation of advisory groups and had influenced the work and expertise of the advisory groups.

SLR inservice has become one of the major concerns of scheduled Region IV meetings, and it is concluded that Objective No. 5 was satisfactorily accomplished.

Objective No. 6: *To develop and maintain coordinative interaction with other agencies which have as their prime function that of career education curriculum development.*

Intended Interactions. Agencies originally intended in this objective are typified by the following examples: The American Association for Vocational Instructional Materials, the Ohio State Center, curriculum laboratories like those in Kentucky and South Carolina, the Center for Occupational Information, the Rural Multiple Institutes Program, the Southwide Research Coordinating Council, the Appalachian Laboratory, the Institute for Human Resource Development, and the National Network of RCUs.

In fact, the Center staff and SLRs have increased their participation in activities associated with such groups. SCCC personnel were involved in a study of the organization and function of the American Association for Vocational Instructional Materials. Other personnel, including the Center Advisory Council representative, participated in the feasibility study of the possibilities of interstate cooperation in developing instructional materials for Vocational-Technical Education Consortium of States (V-TECS)[1] catalogs. Others were involved in projects proposed by the National Committee on Agribusiness Competencies. In each instance, the purposes and procedures of the effort were examined and then the Center's cooperation was given.

On occasions when SCCC representatives interact with other agencies, it is often appropriate to apprise the other group of ways in which the SCCC may assist them. At the Spring 1975 meeting of the Regional Directors of Health Occupations Programs, for example, an SLR was an invited speaker who addressed the topic of the National Network. He gave details of how the process of dissemination may be of use to them in acquiring useful curriculum materials.

The foregoing are examples of types of efforts intended when the original proposal was written. However, early in the grant period priority was given to regionalization--developing coordinative interaction with other State Departments of Vocational Education in neighboring states.

Regionalization. At the Center Director's request, the Mississippi Superintendent of Education and the Director of Vocational-Technical Education sent co-signed letters to their counterparts in neighboring states requesting that

---

[1]V-TECS is a project of the Commission on Occupational Educational Institutions of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Each of its members compile catalogs of performance objectiyes and criterion measures in a variety of job domains. These catalogs are then used in the development of curricula.

individuals be appointed to serve as representatives of their states on the Advisory Council of the SCCC. All states responded by appointing their representatives, the SLRs, and the first regional meeting was held on the MSU campus in September, 1972.

At that meeting, regionalization was given a strong boost when each representative reported on current home-state curriculum development activities. As they shared such information, their need for communication and cooperation became obvious. The early meetings, while productive in terms of information sharing, also required that organization and priorities be considered and a consensus formed. The evidence suggests the group tended to move in a common direction from the beginning. The group appears to support, conceptually at least, the notion that coordination in all aspects of curriculum is a desirable state of affairs.

Much has already been presented in this report on regionalization. The purpose of this short review was to associate that effort principally with this objective.

Dissemination. Dissemination of materials and information about materials related to various aspects of vocational-technical/career education is one of the primary functions of the SCCC. The process of regionalization established the Region IV network through which flow the materials disseminated from the Center at MSU to the various SLRs, and from the SLRs to the Center.

The Center collects material from the other five Curriculum Coordination Centers like itself and distributes, or disseminates, copies to the eight SLRs, including the SLR co-located with the Center at MSU. Copies of material from Region IV states, sent to the SCCC for dissemination, are sent to each of the other five Centers so that each may disseminate the material to its cooperating states.

This process is a major step toward answering a question posed to itself by the Region IV group before it was six months old, "How can our regional coordination efforts contribute to the curriculum development decisions which must be made by the various State Divisions of Vocational-Technical Education and other state educator divisions working in the area of career evaluation?"[1] Through the provision of curriculum materials from all over the nation to each of the member states, decision makers can become *aware* of what is already available and what is not. Accordingly, their decisions on priorities and curriculum development can be made on the basis of a much higher proportion of all the available information than was possible before the SCCC existed.

Details of SLRs' handling of materials are found in the section titled Critical Review of SCCC Operational Procedures. The review suggests that SLR handling of the materials they receive through the SCCC network does not always result in optimal utilization in decision-making. There are, however, known instances in which their receipt of disseminated materials has resulted in the saving of large costs, in terms of time, money, and effort. Examples of such instances are cited throughout this report in connection with various SLR activities. Two examples, said by SLRs to be direct results of SCCC dissemination, are (1) priorities set by a State Department were modified through their staff being made aware of curriculum materials already available elsewhere, and (2) changes in active state curricula were made through the adaptation of large segments of a Free Enterprise program developed in another Region IV state, and Health Materials developed in another region were wholly adopted by the same state.

Various other aspects of dissemination are addressed elsewhere in this report.

---

[1] *Minutes: Second Regional Meeting of Seven Southeastern States,* undated (minutes of January 25-26, 1973 meeting).

Cross-Fertilization. Because SLRs maintain multiple memberships on various committees and serve as reprsentatives to other groups whose purposes overlap those of the Center, coordination and cross-fertilization of information and ideas relating to the Center's objectives and those of the other organizations are mutually enhanced. Obviously, such benefits of widespread interaction cannot be attributed solely to the grant under consideration. They can, however, be cited as accomplishments which are contributed to materially by activities funded or partially funded by this grant.

Avoidance of Duplication. It was the consensus of respondents that dissemination of information about curriculum materials and other forms of coordination of developmental efforts (quarterly meetings, other contacts, etc.) have produced positive actions to prevent duplication of developmental efforts. One example, in which the SLR was able to at least partially quantify the savings realized, was an instance in which a community college had submitted a proposal to the State Department for a curriculum development project in the area of health occupations. The proposal requested $115,000. The respondent felt it was likely the project would have been funded, but he apprised the decision makers of a similar effort already in progress in Virginia. The decision was then made to wait for the materials in progress and to change priorities for the in-state development work.

While the above example is a clear-cut case of substantial savings because of information having got to an SLR in time, a number of other examples were recounted in which respondents, while they could not specify the dollar amounts saved, were certain that substantial savings were realized by the avoidance of duplication resulting from SCCC information dissemination.

It should be pointed out, however, that the desire to avail themselves of materials produced elsewhere was not universal among the member states. One

SLR noted that the peculiar needs of his state required that the state produce its own materials rather than utilizing others. It appeared that the goals of that state differed somewhat from those of the SCCC in this regard.

Evaluative Comments: Objective No. 6. This objective was modified so that its main thrust was regionalization and dissemination of curriculum materials through the Center to and from member states. Regionalization is an accomplished fact. Dissemination is established--if not developed perfectly--and there is evidence that it is producing some of the results which were intended. As an SCCC process, it is impressive. Objective No. 6 was accomplished, though, as noted, there is some variance in the extent to which the member states enter into the regionalization process.

SCCC's Most Important Accomplishment

It may be of interest to the reader to know what the SLRs feel is the Center's single most important accomplishment under the original grant. Summed, the SLR responses name coordination and communication the most important accomplishment. But their qualifying phrases add dimensions to those two concepts which may have to be heard--with the inflections and intonations--to be really appreciated. These people have become *a group* whose fundamental behaviors are *coordination* and *communication*. The group is enthusiastic and excited about what it does when it meets and what its members take back to their respective states.

They spoke of "actual curriculum coordination that has substance, especially as it prevents duplication of effort," the "obvious willingness to work together as an indicator of the progress that has been made in producing a viable Southeastern group," "awareness," "cooperative endeavors," "actual involvement of SLRs in exchange of ideas," "the group itself--cooperative spirit, rapport," and

"getting the people in Curriculum in their states together and making them aware of what is available in the region and nation-wide,"

Finally, although the following statement was made by an individual SLR, it was very characteristic: "Now we do have a means of communicating between states things that happen in the region. Our group is the number one method of communication in the region--more than any other method."

Adequacy of Accomplishment of Objectives

SLRs were asked to give their judgments on the degree of adequacy of accomplishment of each of the six objectives of the first grant. The following scale was used in Table 1:

1 = Much more than adequate
2 = More than adequate
3 = Adequate
4 = Less than adequate
5 = Much less than adequate
X = I know something is planned or has been done in this area, but I don't know enough about it to make a judgment
Y = I have no knowledge pertaining to this

All SLRs judged the accomplishment of all six objectives. The figure shown by each objective represents the mean of the values assigned by the SLRs. The number of Xs and Ys, if any, is also shown.

Table 1

Original Objectives: SLR Assessment of Adequacy of Accomplishment

Objectives	Adequacy of Accomplishment	X	Y
1. To further develop an existing administrative organization and structure for coordination of career education curriculum research, development, diffusion, and evaluation	2.5		
2. To conduct curriculum development activities which focus on the articulation of career education concepts with other aspects of education	2.9		1

Table 1 (Continued)

Objectives	Adequacy of Accomplishment	X	Y
3. To expand CCU-RCU physical capabilities for the development and production of career education curriculum components	2.2		3
4. To utilize appropriate curriculum development systems and information systems which will further career education curriculum development activities	2.4		1
5. To expand the capabilities of the CCU-RCU so that inservice training of educational personnel can be focused on adoption and utilization of curriculum programs and materials	2.8		2
6. To develop and maintain coordinative interaction with other agencies which have as their prime function that of career education curriculum development	2.5		

CURRENT GRANT: CRITICAL REVIEW OF SCCC OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES

Summary of SLR Responses

Interview data were collected to allow a review of activities under the current grant as described in the Approach section. The respondents were the eight SLRs of Region IV. Their responses are summarized for presentation. When responses varied widely, more response material is presented to represent fairly that range. It will be recalled that the current grant had been in operation for less than six months at the time the data were collected.

The summarized responses are presented here in different order and content groupings from that in which the questions were asked during the structured interviews. This is done to facilitate exposition.

Description of SLRs. Region IV SLRs typically are Directors of curriculum development units, and their most frequent duties are listed as managing the development of curriculum. Other duties mentioned, in descending order of frequency, are: coordinating curriculum with State Departments and Universities; research and coordinating research; planning; managing materials reproduction; dissemination; diffusion; personnel development; budgeting; developing curriculum; and coordinating SCCC/state communications. Length of time in their primary jobs averaged 4 years, 9 months, with a range of 1.5 to 10 years. Four had earned Doctorates; three were in doctoral programs; and one listed a Masters Degree. Degrees typically were in Education and Curriculum.

While all respondents' offices were funded mainly or totally by their State Departments of Vocational Education, five offices were located administratively in those Departments and three were in University settings.

All SLRs had been appointed to their roles; none had volunteered. Three became SLRs upon regionalization of the states in 1972; one had served for two years, one for nine months, and three for six months (two of these SLRs had served in the Kentucky group--one as Director--until January of 1975, when they joined the SCCC).

Context, Activities, and Knowledge of Results. Each SLR reported he/she is free to perform SCCC-related duties the way he/she desires, within the policies and guidelines of his/her State Department or University. Some interact frequently with their State Directors, but not necessarily on SCCC matters. Their opinions, in general, are that State Directors know relatively little about the SCCC. (This was generally borne out in subsequent interviews with their State Directors, with a few exceptions.)

SLRs reported that their incidental expenses, postage, phone calls, etc., in connection with SCCC duties, are borne by their Departments and are not a problem.

Dissemination Records. SLR respondents typically are not keeping records of the materials they receive from the Center and of what they do with them, and those who have some system expressed reservations about its efficiency. Most respondents expressed feelings that records of such transactions should be kept, and some have made plans to begin such record-keeping. When interviewed, most SLRs had to depend on memory for information about where SCCC materials went after they were received. A system is being effected in Florida--FERIC (Florida ERIC)--which allows computerized retrieval of all accessions from the SCCC, who borrows them, and additional information about the use to which the materials are put.

Several respondents suggested that their keeping track of the materials they received from the Center had received little or no emphasis, but that they felt such information could be useful to the Center. They also indicated that if the Center Director were to indicate that specific records were to be used to enhance Center dissemination/diffusion activities, they would willingly keep the appropriate records.

Dissemination Interactions. On SCCC matters, particularly in passing along materials disseminated from the Center, SLRs report that they interact most frequently with curriculum supervisors/developers in curriculum development laboratories and in their State Departments and with teacher educators. Others with whom they interact are teachers (usually in workshops), vocational supervisors at the local level, and their superiors. These contacts are currently made, almost exclusively, by the SLRs, but there were some reports that curriculum developers and teachers are initiating requests for curriculum materials more frequently than in the past. In fact, all respondents have noted a definite increase during the past year in requests for curriculum materials from developers and teachers. Teachers are especially interested in acquiring materials

which are ready to use and in which they can be given preparation training, Many feel they do not have time to "figure out" new materials on their own and want inservice for any new materials.

The most typical SLR method of distributing materials received from the Center is as follows: the material is scanned to determine who should get it; in some cases, transmittal memos are then attached; it is sent or taken to the most appropriate person, most often a curriculum supervisor/developer. If there are multiple copies, it is sent to a wider audience (usually State staff members or teacher educators), and a copy is retained by the SLR or is put in a holding facility or library.

In some cases, single copies of materials are supposed to be returned to the SLR or to a library after use. In Florida, the material is screened, cataloged, and put into FERIC.

Some respondents feel the material often gets "buried" in the offices of the people to whom it is sent, without adequate review.

Dissemination Feedback. The feedback that respondents get on their materials dissemination is sketchy, at best. Most often, they reported essentially no feedback at all on how, or the extent to which, the materials were diffused--adapted or adopted. It was the general feeling that once the materials had been passed on, they disappeared without a trace. Systematic feedback is not now a part of the system. Despite this, some feedback does trickle in. In fact, some SLRs were able to provide information on specific instances of the utilization in their states of materials developed elsewhere and disseminated through the SCCC. More often than not, though, materials were adapted or used to supplement existing efforts instead of being adopted outright. In some of these instances, duplication of effort was prevented, but costs saved usually were not known. An exception was the Florida example cited

previously. Only one respondent indicated that materials disseminated from another state had gone directly to local-level classrooms without special teacher preparation.

No evidence of research or curriculum development begun as a result of SCCC encouragement was reported. In commenting on this subject, however, a respondent strongly urged the development of standard formats for Region IV vocational curricula to facilitate sharing, adaptation, and adoption. He stated that he knew of many cases in which the acceptance of good materials was "hurt" because their formats were "different" from that used in his state. While no quantitative evidence was available for the SCCC's cost-effectiveness, one respondent suggested the question should not even be asked until the Center is more highly developed and fully established. Five of the respondents knew of no applicaiton of SCCC disseminated materials to their states' "start-up" training, two said the materials "probably" had been utilized there, and one knew of actual utilization.

Dissemination Changes. Most SLRs felt that certain changes in procedures, in the system, and in the information available to them would increase the effectiveness of their coordinative functions. A much-stressed need was their receiving appropriate detailed information describing disseminated materials prior to or with the materials themselves. Use of the Materials in Progress and Materials Completed forms already described would help greatly. Respondents feel they do not have time to examine every piece of material in detail. They also pointed out that addition of descriptive forms at the Center level would preclude the necessity of that process being repeated by each of the eight SLRs.

Other changes needed were cited. SLRs should: transmit more usable information about the SCCC to State Department administrators; set themselves up to get more feedback from the people to whom they disseminate materials;

systematize their SLR duties more and devote a little more planning and attention to them; make more of an effort to actually utilize a higher proportion of materials developed by others; set up systems to locate materials after they have passed it on; and call on the expertise of fellow SLRs more often. They felt it would be an improvement if they got either multiple copies of materials from the Center or were able to copy some of them for in-state distribution.

A majority of the respondents indicated they feel SCCC calendars of events would be useful if they included information like meeting dates, due dates, and when to expect various products. Calendars might also be set up as logs for keeping SCCC records.

Reporting Materials. SLRs were asked what proportion of vocational-technical/career education materials developed in their states was reported to the Center for inclusion in published lists. A large majority of the respondents indicated that not all materials are being reported. Proportions reported ranged from, "We haven't shared it all," to "none." Several reasons were given for current reporting practices, such as: "We don't know of everything that's being developed"; "We don't have the necessary network for finding out about everything being developed"; "Some things developed are not appropriate to report"; "Some are not good enough to report"; and "Only validated materials are reported." The main inhibiting factor mentioned most often was the cost of sharing the developed materials which would be requested if information about their development appeared in a published list or was otherwise publicized. Some felt their states have barely enough funds allocated to print the materials needed in those states; others have no convenient method of selling their materials--even on a cost-recovery basis. Several reported they had received requests for "all the material you have on hand, in the area of . . . to be cited in a bibliography," or "for our library." Such requests usually cannot

be fulfilled and are held in disdain,

There was a wide variation across Region IV states in their policies regarding sending finished copies of their developed materials directly to other states. Apparently only one state, South Carolina, is currently sending completed copies of the Instructional Materials in Progress and Materials Completed forms along with the materials they disseminate. An SLR expressed the wish that states had reciprocal agreements to bypass copyrights and thus allow full use of each other's materials.

Although arrangements had been made at the May 1975 quarterly meeting to furnish every SLR with copies of both forms, several respondents said they had copies of the Materials in Progress forms on hand but had not received copies of the Materials Completed forms.

Current State Priorities. Competency-based education was listed among top priorities in four Region IV states. Other priority areas listed included: individualization; diffusion; personnel development among public school vocational teachers, college teachers, and State Departement staff; start-up training; and various career education sub-areas. One of Florida's priority efforts is to institute a systematic state-wide program to develop curricula which will end the widespread use of teacher-workshop-built curricula. It was the opinion of several of the SLRs that SCCC and National Network activities were influential in the setting of these priorities through information shared at meetings and materials disseminated to the states.

Setting Priorities. The process of establishing vocational education priorities is unique in each of the Region IV states. It does not appear to have been formalized in any of the states. Rather, it was usually described as a process in which various groups collect information, confer, advise, and thereby establish priorities. Several elements, while not common to all states'

methods, were encountered more than others. For example, State Department staff appear to be most influential in the process, directing the collection of information to be considered, and usually providing the major influence in the decisions. Most SLRs appear to be in positions from which they can make significant inputs to final decisions.

Identifying Alternatives. In discussing the methods by which their states identify the alternatives to meet established needs and priorities, some SLRs frankly expressed ignorance, having never participated in the process themselves. Others suggested the processes in their states were less than systematic. Several indicated that inputs provided by SLRs are especially useful at the point when alternative solutions are being explored. Respondents cited development contracts issued to various agencies as one form of preferred alternative.

In most cases, SLRs mentioned the importance of maintaining a continuous search for similar or related materials available or being developed during the entire process of curriculum development projects, noting that the search for materials should not be dropped, especially when the actual construction of materials begins.

Materials Development. In addressing their states' development of materials, SLRs voiced some degree of support for an eclectic approach. Examples of this approach include: combining new materials developed elsewhere with what is already in use through teacher workshops; getting teacher groups to work on new materials, often with the assistance of consultants; and adopting materials developed elsewhere. All these methods are currently in use in the SCCC region, and it appeared that any or all may be used by any of the states, as appropriate.

Diffusion. The developed materials usually are diffused through teacher inservice workshops. Those workshops are often produced and managed by the developers of the material. Teacher workshops which develop new material

usually simultaneously provide the training necessary for teacher implementation of the materials. In North Carolina, Demonstration Centers are used extensively to diffuse materials and techniques to the local level.

Evaluation. Presently no systematic, comprehensive evaluation of newly developed materials is a part of any state's program. Impact on students and other groups affected by a given curriculum is not assessed in quantitative terms. Systematic assessment of impact is not available at a cost which can be borne by most education systems. Instead, evaluative comments from instructors, students, and vocational supervisors comprise typical evaluations. The planned institution of performance-based instructional systems will facilitate the production of data bases useful in comprehensive evaluation of curricula.

Communication. Nearly all SLRs felt that communication within Region IV could and should be improved. Some willingly pointed out that they shared the responsibility for the current less-than-ideal state of communication and indicated they had thought about what to do to improve it. Typically, they feel they do not keep the Center as well aware as it should be of their needs which arise from time to time in the conduct of their primary jobs, in special projects, and in their problems with which the SCCC particularly concerns itself. A few feel they, themselves, may not really have been sufficiently aware of the Center's potential for assistance, or availed themselves fully of its collective problem-solving capacity.

When asked about the overall adequacy of SCCC communication, the typical response was that it is not as good as it should be, but that it is getting better. Most SLRs indicated that they had very positive feelings about other individuals in the group, and that it was important that they get to know each other better through quarterly meetings, various other vocational education contacts, and SCCC coordinative activities. One SLR felt that SCCC

communication is adequate, except in the area of knowing what materials are being developed elsewhere in Region IV. Another suggested that a national telephone network connecting the various curriculum laboratories would be most useful. In general, their comments seemed to anticipate more communication and higher-level communication among SCCC members as they become better acquainted and as SCCC activities become better organized and institutionalized. Most respondents volunteered positive expressions that the present third-party evaluation data-gathering effort was characteristic of the Center's attempts to stay abreast of what the membership feels should be done.

Only about half of the respondents felt they had kept the Director and other SLRs sufficiently apprised of their states' needs and priorities to permit full and appropriate response on such matters.

Despite its imperfections, communication among SCCC members consistently received many favorable comments, and it was the consensus that, although it is expected to improve, the total increase in communication already provided through the SCCC is considered invaluable.

Newsletter. A newsletter as a communicative device was discussed. Three SLRs saw no need for a newsletter, and most of the others expressed their perceptions that they already are deluged with things to read. Despite these reservations, the majority gave thoughtful answers to questions about how a newsletter might further the organization's goals by informing its audience of what is available, helping to avoid duplication, increasing coordination, and by serving to inform important target audiences of what the SCCC is and how it may assist them. Some examples of their suggestions for an SCCC newsletter were: use a concise format; use summary information; be highly selective of material; include important announcements and reminders; run a really good feature from a member state in each copy; and update information on materials in progress and completed.

Target audiences which were suggested for a newsletter included virtually everybody from the State Director to the classroom teacher. The consensus was that certain issues of a newsletter could be prepared especially for a specific, important target audience--curriculum developers, vocational teachers, State Department staff, teacher educators, etc.

Meetings. Quarterly meetings were described as generally excellent, with pertinent, timely topics and well-managed, and with good progress toward the objectives. A criticism which occurred several times with regard to appropriateness of meeting activities was that discussions sometimes get bogged down in details which should be left for an appropriate individual to resolve and that discussions are too often sidetracked, sometimes to the detriment of the session.

Pertinence of information and proper disposal of matters which come before the members are considered good. Timeliness of meetings is considered good. One respondent, however, felt meetings should be more frequent while the organization is still in its early stage of development. Having the meetings at locations were pertinent, ongoing projects can be examined is felt to be a most attractive inservice feature of the meetings.

The one aspect of typical meetings which, overall, received the most enthusiastic and positive responses was the information picked up between sessions, at coffee breaks, etc. Two SLRs suggested this factor may actually be the single most valuable part of the meetings. Such comments were not meant to denigrate the planned segments ot the meetings in any way, but were indications that personal interactions among members of the group had been, on occasion, especially beneficial for them. Information about material in development, for example, often is exchanged in an informal way, although unavailable through formal reporting channels. Based on information acquired this way, Mississippi decided to postpone development of Business and Office individual instructional

packets when they found that Kentucky and Georgia already were working on them. Plans were made to share the finished materials. One SLR mentioned he developed contacts through which he received important consulting services and provided for his staff's attendance at workshops.

Meeting-Related Behavior Changes. Respondents were asked if they could give examples of changes in their behavior which could be attributed to SCCC meetings. Each respondent had a number of examples which could be cited as changes which they perceived to have been largely the results of their interactions at these meetings. Usually, they provided general statements about their new use of a technique or their adoption of a different point of view, perhaps a new attitude toward some aspect of curriculum. Some typical examples are: "Behavior changed when I learned about North Carolina's audit on their Disadvantaged money"; "As a group, we try harder now to change things, and to do them better than we used to"; "Much of the content of the change agent workshop is now actually incorporated in my state"; "My planning behavior has been changed"; "Changed my level of awareness about the role we should play in my state"; "We now use the 'two phase' idea in our field testing."

Staffing. Respondents were divided on whether additional people are needed in the SCCC to improve its functioning. Some felt SLRs can be maximally effective if the duties continue to be handled as additional duties to one's primary duties. Others felt the SLR's job could be handled better by a one-half or full-time person; one SLR said her state could use two SLRs. A suggestion was offered that the SCCC needs a "circuit rider," to spend time between meetings with each SLR. Such a person could review what is going on around the circuit, pass information from state to state, and facilitate cross-fertilization. As a member of the Center staff, the circuit rider could keep the Center informed of Region IV activities.

If dissemination and diffusion are developed by the Center, "the way it should be," according to one SLR, those duties could keep two SLRs busy full-time in each state. Another respondent suggested SLR should be a full-time job, paid through the Center. Still another respondent felt the SLR ideally should be a respected staff member, but not have so much authority that associates would be threatened when presented information, and it would be ideal if the person's duties cut across departments and interacted with the duties of many other people. It was felt that the SLR should also have easy access to the State Director.

SLRs were asked if they thought the Directorship of the SCCC should be a full-time job. Only a couple of respondents felt they knew enough about the job to respond thoughtfully; one said it should be a full-time job, and the other said he thought one-half time could cover it.

Continuity. Respondents' experience with ERIC has tended to make them sensitive to continuity of services. With regard to the Center's location at MSU, the consensus was that it should remain there as long as it does the job it is supposed to do. They clearly prefer the Center to be left in one location to develop, and to know the Center they are dealing with is not tentative, that it is stable, and that it has a trained staff. One SLR suggested that proposals to establish Centers from other states could be used to supply ideas to the existing Center. Several mentioned that, from the Center's point of view, stable funding at known levels is required for planning purposes, and that the SCCC should be funded at a higher level than the present.

V-TECS. Six of the Region IV states are V-TECS members; two are not. Member respondents were asked how the SCCC can best serve V-TECS in their states. The most frequent answer was that the Center should provide all the pertinent materials possible to the developers of the V-TECS materials. Two SLRs felt

that V-TECS should share fully its products through the Center, even to non-member states. It was also suggested that the Center might be the appropriate reproduction facility for V-TECS materials. One SLR stated that the SCCC had served well in keeping the National Network and Region IV informed on the formation of V-TECS and its subsequent development. One SLR reported that "undue pressure" had been exerted by the Center for full Region IV participation in V-TECS.

Role of the SCCC. If the SCCC were operating ideally, what are the most useful changes that could be effected? Several respondents felt that personnel development through Center-sponsored inservice workshops on all aspects of curriculum development, especially diffusion, would be most important. Other most useful changes mentioned were the upgrading of the quality of curriculum materials through greater uniformity of materials, reduction of duplication of effort, and the use of accompanying forms which adequately describe the materials. Several felt it would be especially useful if the Center could set up a problem-solving service to deal with member states' various needs for special consultants and a telephone service for immediate access to any part of the SCCC system.

The modal perception of the SCCC's current role is one of dissemination--more than of diffusion. Five respondents felt an evaluation of SCCC activities should be based on its dissemination activities because the Center has neither the staff nor the procedures to diffuse materials in Region IV. Furthermore, they felt diffusion is each state's responsibility. One SLR added that "Dissemination is a big, worthwhile goal, and some of the other objectives might well be left alone." Two SLRs thought an evaluaton should be based on both dissemination and diffusion activities, and one said it should be based on "what the SLRs say they are getting out of the Center."

SCCC Director's Role. SLRs' general recommendations for changes in the Director's role were focused on programmatic achievements: produce a glossary of terms and standardize terminology, push for getting comprehensive descriptions of materials appended to them, push for greater access to Region IV-developed materials, increase actual coordination of development in region. They also suggested: more coordination during meetings, encouragement for SLRs to take more active roles, and additional constructive criticism of members' SCCC activities.

State Director's Role. Recommendations centered on getting SDs more informed of SCCC activities and enlisting their active support for its mission.

SLRs' Judgment of Accomplishment, To Date, of Current Enabling Objectives. SLRs were asked to judge the adequacy of accomplishment *to date* of the enabling objectives of the current grant.

As the current grant period began in January, 1975, approximately six months had passed in which progress toward the accomplishment of the current objectives could be made. Accordingly, respondents were asked to make their judgments on the basis of their "knowledge of progress toward accomplishment of each objective--up to this point in time" (time of the interview). It was noted that several of the SLRs indicated they had not seen the objectives of the current grant before. The following scale was used in Table 2:

1 = Much more than adequate
2 = More than adequate
3 = Adequate
4 = Less than adequate
5 = Much less than adequate
X = I know something is planned or has been done in this area, but I don't know enough about it to make a judgment
Y = I have no knowledge pertaining to this

All SLRs responded to all items. The figure shown with each enabling objective represents the mean of the values assigned by the respondents. The number of Xs and Ys, if any, is also shown.

Table 2

Current Objectives: SLR Assessment
of Adequacy of Accomplishment

Objectives	Adequacy of Accomplishment To Date	X	Y
1. To promote the development and dissemination of vocational-technical curriculum materials for use in teaching occupational subjects, including curriculums for new and changing occupational fields and those in public service.			
Enabling Objectives			
A. To assess: (1) needs for development of vocational-technical curriculum materials;	2.7	5	
(2) needs for dissemination of vocational technical curriculum materials	3.2	1	1
B. To inform the region and network of materials under development;	3.0	1	1
C. To serve as implementor for duplication and dissemination of newly developed curriculum materials;	2.3		
D. To establish a curriculum review panel for curriculum materials under development; and	3.0	5	
E. To provide input data for curriculum research decisions.	2.8	2	
2. To develop standards for curriculum development in all occupational fields.			
Enabling Objectives			
A. To assess current formats, validation strategies, and field testing of curriculum materials in the region;	2.3	5	
B. To develop standards in formats, validation and field testing for curriculum materials in the region;	3.3	5	

Table 2 (Continued)

Objectives	Adequacy of Accomplishment To Date	X	Y
C. To design task analysis procedures, methods, techniques and instruments to be used in curriculum materials development; and	3.0	4	
D. To identify and develop capabilities of interstate consortiums for curriculum materials standardization.	2.8	4	
3. To coordinate efforts of the states in the preparation of curriculum materials and also in the preparation of current lists of curriculum materials available in all occupational fields.			
Enabling Objectives			
A. To conduct periodic regional curriculum planning and update meetings;	3.3	4	
B. To provide a continuous flow of information to states concerning curriculum development activities in the region and nation;	2.3		
C. To provide AIM/ARM with abstracts of curriculum materials developed in the region;	2.8	1	
D. To provide searches on request from states and network on curriculum materials;	2.8	3	
E. To maintain a curriculum materials library and provide lending services;	2.0	2	
F. To provide a distribution system for curriculum materials developed in the region;	2.4		
G. To provide a curriculum materials microfische service;	2.0	2	
H. To stimulate exchange of curriculum materials within the states in the region;	2.3	1	
I. To serve as a center for curriculum validation coordination;	4.0		
J. To serve as consultants to states with special problems in preparation of curriculum materials;	2.0	5	1
K. To encourage establishment of curriculum advisory committees in each affiliated state.	2.8	4	

Table 2 (Continued)

Objectives	Adequacy of Accomplishment To Date	X	Y
4. To survey curriculum materials produced by other agencies of the Government, including the Department of Defense.			
Enabling Objectives			
A. To develop a liaison among Government agencies developing curriculum materials and the Curriculum Management Center;	3.0	4	
B. To develop a catalog of Government agencies' curriculum materials available; and	3.0	7	
C. To obtain copies of available curriculum materials developed by Government agencies for inclusion in the Curriculum Management Center library.	3.0	5	
5. To evaluate vocational-technical education curriculum materials and their uses.			
Enabling Objectives			
A. To collect and distribute curriculum impact data and other pertinent information;	3.5	1	
B. To develop curriculum evaluation capabilities of each state in the region;	4.0	3	
C. To establish curriculum review panels;	4.0	1	
D. To identify steps needed for the improvement of the curriculum development process in the region; and	3.5	1	
E. To evaluate the curriculum validation processes currently being used by states in the region.	3.5	1	
6. To train personnel in curriculum development.			
Enabling Objectives			
A. To provide inservice training for development of curriculum development personnel;	2.4	3	

Table 2 (Continued)

Objectives	Adequacy of Accomplishment To Date	X	Y
B. To provide inservice training for use of new and/or innovative curriculum materials;	3.0	4	
C. To provide demonstrations of exemplary curriculums; and	2.6	3	
D. To identify and/or develop curriculum development personnel training model.	2.0	7	

Summary of Comments of State Directors of Vocational Education

Six of the eight Region IV State Directors were interviewed. Two were unavailable, and, in one of these cases, the Assistant State Director was interviewed. A structured interview similar to the SLR interview, but much shorter, was prepared for use with State Directors.

Despite their conceptual support of the SCCC and its mission, Directors typically knew relatively little about SCCC functioning and activity in their states. There were a couple of notable exceptions, however, and those Directors were able to discuss not only the day-to-day procedures of concern, but to make recommendations for their improvement.

At the time of this writing, plans have been made to invite State Directors to an SCCC quarterly meeting. It is anticipated that their attendance would improve their general and specific knowledge of the SCCC and, consequently, their ability to contribute to the accomplishment of its mission in their states.

There were few items related to SCCC operations on which there was consensus. One exception is the importance of inservice for teachers as a part of the diffusion process. There appeared to be agreement that SCCC workshops for state

groups which produce inservice aimed at teacher acceptance and adoption of curriculum materials would be an appropriate area of concern. A number of comments indicated that teacher inservice is recognized to be of critical importance in teacher acceptance of curriculum material--particularly in view of traditional local determination of curriculum. Some Directors perceive that a curriculum developed "elsewhere" already has two strikes against its acceptance. As one Director said, "(We) don't have as much luck using the materials developed elsewhere."

Demonstration workshops as a medium of SCCC technique/state-of-the-art diffusion activities with Region IV state personnel was suggested on several occasions.

It was the consensus that studies of curriculum impact are seldom performed in Region IV. Evaluation of new curricula is typically composed of jury validation or teacher comments in teacher meetings after the curricula have been implemented for a while. Very little empirical evaluation is performed dealing with behavior changes of curriculum target groups.

While not articulated in just these terms, several Directors appeared to "leave the details" of SCCC activities to their SLRs. Fewer than half of the Directors interviewed reported interactions on SCCC matters with their SLRs and even fewer recalled seeing the slide-tape presentation, "The Learning Network--The National Network for Curriculum Coordination."

Their modal perceived importance of the SCCC to their states' priorities and needs may be summed up in the statement of one Director, "I don't see much evidence of the Center in the decisions we sit around this table and make."

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

An evaluation undertaken to determine the effects of activities requires comparable sets of data which describe (1) before-treatment or baseline status, and (2) post-treatment or outcome status of the system to which the activities were applied. In the present case, strictly evaluative methods were not possible because there were no baseline data and only desultory outcome data.

It would be inappropriate to attempt to compare the current status of accomplishment of SCCC objectives with an assumed baseline status of total lack of accomplishment because it is known that some informal coordinative activities already were in effect in Region IV.

Some coordinative structures of major importance now exist due principally to SCCC activities. It should be noted, however, that which ones would have developed in its absence, and to what degree they would have developed, cannot be determined. Also, it is known that the SCCC's current status has been influenced strongly by various factors such as V-TECS and the availability and use of EPDA funds, for example, but the extent of such influences cannot be determined.

Consequently, the present evaluation efforts have been devoted to comparisons of SCCC activities and outcomes with the original grant objectives, which were stated in terms that were not all quantifiable. Some of the objectives were modified in response to evolving needs of USOE, the National Network, and Region IV states during the course of the work. While the focus of the work was sharpened appropriately thereby, the state of flux of the objectives tended to blur evaluative activities, particularly in view of the time available for the work.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The overall mission of the original grant, as modified in response to USOE guidelines, funding limitations, and the evolving needs of states served by the Center, may be said, in a general sense, to have been accomplished.

Objective No. 1. An administrative organization was established, as was a foundation for regional communication and coordination, resulting in the effective accomplishment of the objective.

Objective No. 2. Work associated with this objective was principally performed adequately in Mississippi. It was concluded that this objective was not accomplished to the extent that was desired for all member states.

Objective No. 3. Augmentation of the Center's capabilities in line with this objective resulted in its accomplishment.

Objective No. 4. A framework for dissemination was established, but the characteristically high proportion of unreported materials developed in some Region IV states allowed only partial accomplishment of this objective.

Objective No. 5. The inservice activities of SLRs and resulting home-state changes pursuant to the mission of the SCCC, particularly in diffusion activities, resulted in the satisfactory accomplishment of this objective.

Objective No. 6. Regionalization of neighboring states was effected, with its concomitant coordinative features. While there is some variation in the extent to which member states involve themselves in the regionalization process, the objective was accomplished.

2. Despite differences between the priorities of the several states and between the goals of the SCCC and some of the states, Region IV members have formed a cohesive working group. Their heightened awareness of the need for, and their increasingly effective use of coordination and communication, arising from their SCCC interactions, have led to many of the useful changes they have

achieved in their states and region. A wide variety of improvements in local-level curriculum processes throughout Region IV may be attributed to the change agent roles played by SCCC members. Such achievements have reinforced their SCCC interactions.

3. A characteristic of the SCCC is its evolutionary nature, in which change for the sake of improvement is actively sought by both the Director and membership. As Region IV needs are identified, the group has attempted to identify and implement procedures to meet those needs. To the extent these responsive changes meet the needs, they have become institutionalized.

4. The procedures for dissemination of materials among the six Curriculum Coordination Centers and from the Center at MSU to member SLRs appear to be more effective than the reciprocal procedures for making available to the Center at MSU those materials developed in some of the Region IV states. Sharing of materials developed by all Region IV states is unlikely to approach the ideal level until the process of sharing such materials is changed to become more reinforcing and less punishing than at present.

5. The data collection process in the present evaluation served as change agent by precipitating individual examinations in detail by SCCC members of their own and the group's SCCC-related activities. Through these examinations, increased awareness was achieved of various individual and group needs, e.g., systematic observation and recording of impact data. The presence of a presumed accompanying readiness to record such data may be empirically determined.

6. The evidence indicates that teacher utilization of new curriculum material is partly a function of their acceptance of the material. Some factors reported by respondents to be related to teachers' acceptance of materials include: the extent of their need for new material, their awareness of what is

available, its cost (in time/effort) to prepare it for use, the availability of related inservice, and their degree of involvement in its preparation, adaptation, or adoption.

7. The extent to which Region IV State Directors of Vocational Education are able to promote SCCC mission accomplishment is virtually unknown. Little evidence was found of activities they had initiated in direct support of the SCCC.

8. The need for more systematic procedures in administration and dissemination activities, as well as in the fulfillment of SLR roles, appears to be indicated.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The SCCC

1. The need for additional systematic structure is indicated. The SCCC should give consideration to a system of management by objectives. This would offer the dual advantages of more efficient and effective operations, and of serving as an example for member states. A more systematic and performance-oriented approach in translating the objectives of the SCCC and its member states into behaviors which will accomplish them is recommended.

2. Through clarification of the SCCC's objectives and members' roles, more participation by members in the accomplishment of those objectives will be encouraged. In addition, SCCC objectives and Region IV priorities may be seen as more complementary. More target audiences will become accessible and allied if the behavioral outcomes they desire are shown to coincide with SCCC-desired outcomes and procedures to facilitate those outcomes.

Therefore, an attempt should be made to accomplish as many objectives as possible by developing and institutionalizing routine procedures which will accomplish them, thus freeing administrators and innovators to work on development of procedures to accomplish additional objectives satisfactorily. Routine procedures should be delegated to staff below administrative level.

3. Comprehensive, behaviorally stated job descriptions should be prepared for all SCCC positions. They should be made a matter of record, as should any subsequent modifications to them. Modifications should be made, as necessary, for mission accomplishment. Work outcomes with regard to specific assignments should be stated in performance terms.

4. A management information system should be established based on systematic feedback data from Region IV states. Its primary purpose would be to collect data which allow SCCC management and members to maximize the SCCC's responsiveness to the needs of Revion IV. Objectives should be specified clearly enough to determine the required kinds of data relating to their accomplishment, and procedures should be established for the systematic collection, reduction, and analysis of those data for SCCC personnel.

5. The SCCC should assure that all materials disseminated through the Center to other Centers and to states in Region IV are accompanied or preceded by "Announcements of Release of Instructional Materials" or "Instructional Materials in Progress." The SCCC should continue to work to establish procedures whereby developers and subsequent users affix such information to materials to provide maximum information to potential users.

6. For improved long-range Region IV coordination, an attempt should be made to bring full SCCC Advisory Council knowledge and expertise to bear on the establishment of major priorities of each of the Region IV states through the

Council's attendance at appropriate regional meetings of State Directors of Vocational Education, or through meeting with Directors and their staffs in the individual states.

7. Formats of routine or recurring SCCC memoranda, letters, notifications of meetings, minutes of meetings, Quarterly Research Reports, etc., should be formalized in the interest of efficiency of delivering information to the target audience. Elements necessary to each kind of document should be identified, and strict formats which include them should be followed.

8. The SCCC should establish and coordinate a Region IV Curriculum Personnel Resources Profile in which individuals are identified who have a high degree of the various skills/expertise required in all aspects of curriculum development and who can serve as consultants. Methods should also be identified which can make these individuals available to the people who need their services.

9. SCCC activities should be examined to determine how additional people of importance to its objectives could be involved actively. For example, State Department staff could be utilized for consultative purposes.

10. SCCC membership should consider the possibility that Federal funding could become unavailable or insufficient for such an activity as the present one. If such is considered a possibility, a contingency plan should be considered, in the interest of continuity of services, in which the member states would contribute to a central fund administered by a single Center.

SLRs

11. SLRs' roles should be defined as a set of behavior common to all SLRs, with specific additional activities identified for each SLR which relate to needs and priorities of that SLR's home state. Projected individual SLR activities should be regularly presented at quarterly meetings and the SLRs

should present follow-up reports at subsequent meetings to allow peer assessment/assistance. The job descriptions of the Center staff and SLRs should be made complementary and interrelated.

12. Data which should be generated and/or collected by SLRs need to be specified. Among the kinds of data to be collected, consideration should be given to data relating to the specific uses of materials disseminated through the Center. Data forms, logs, etc., needed for data handling should be developed by the Center with member assistance. Dissemination logs should be developed for use by SLRs to provide a history of the routes and uses of materials and to update the SCCC's master log.

Dissemination

13. The Center should attempt to have modified those state situations which operate to preclude sharing of materials developed. Concerted efforts should be made to set up state policies to sell materials and otherwise facilitate materials-sharing. Alternatively, the Center could serve as the production, sales, and distribution facility.

Diffusion

14. The SCCC should examine carefully whether its dissemination procedures, including SLRs' dissemination procedures of materials, are actually accomplishing the awareness phase of diffusion. A data system should be developed to provide required management information on diffusion.

Meetings

15. The practice of having periods of free time between scheduled activities at meetings should be continued. This will facilitate SLR interactions on important matters not on the formal meeting agenda.

16. Time should be set aside on the agenda of meetings to devote to chronic problems. Each SLR should be requested well in advance of the meeting to consider such problems and approaches to their solution.

17. Quarterly meetings should include SLR reports on the details of their dissemination activities. In this way, the Center will be able to account, far better than in the past, for the Region IV in-state manipulation of specific materials disseminated through the Center.

Minutes/Reports

18. Minutes of meetings should follow a format developed to maximize the intended purposes of that category of report. One of the purposes should be to provide a review of all the salient points made by speakers. It probably is most effective to present the major points of the material in as near its original form as possible. Format should be consistent for ease of reference.

19. Minutes and reports of activities should be written in performance-oriented terms, to the extent possible, in order for the reader to evaluate progress from one reporting period to the next. Reports should answer the questions of what and how much more has been accomplished since the last report. The status of every active objective and enabling objective should be updated in each report. Planned activities should be specified in terms which allow their comparison with subsequently reported progress.

Evaluation

20. All planned activities related to the accomplishment of objectives should be set up, to the extent possible, so that data are generated on those activities. In general, each activity should be viewed in terms of its quantifiable characteristics--its impact, its cost, etc.

21. The requirements of planned evaluations should be anticipated in order to assure that the data to meet those requirements are being generated and collected.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW GUIDE: STATE LIAISON REPRESENTATIVES (SLRs)

State

Respondent's name

Primary job title/Length of time in job

Main duties of primary job

Highest degree earned/Subject area

Administrative location (State Department Vocational Education, University, other)

Length of time as SLR/Appointed or volunteered/Most appropriate person to be SLR

Have freedom to perform SLR job the way you feel it should be done

Any state, local, or other influences on performance of SLR job

Interactions of State Director and SLR/Influences on each other in SCCC activities

Source of funds for SLR in-state job activities (phone, postage)

Records of SCCC activities

With whom do you interact on SCCC matters

Who contacts whom/how often/on schedule/meetings/workshops/nature of contacts/what is exchanged/feedback from contacts/who has seen slide-tape presentation on Network activities (has State Director seen it)

Distribution methods of SCCC materials (details)

What needs to be done differently to improve effectiveness of SLR job

Activity checklists, calendars--would they be of assistance

Evidence of use of SCCC materials disseminated

Avoidance of duplication/start-up training/encouragement of research curriculum development, implementation/cost effectiveness

Ways to trace routes, use of materials from SCCC

How could dissemination of materials be improved

Are materials disseminated directly to classroom/if so, provisions for teacher training in use of the materials

Trends of requests for vocational-technical materials

Proportion of in-state voc-tec materials in development or completed which are reported/Made available to SCCC/Sent directly to other states/Methods of in-state collection of materials, preparation for distribution

Other agencies serve same function as SCCC, overlap

Your state's current primary voc-tec/career education interests and activities in curriculum development/additional major problems and issues

Has SCCC had an effect on any of above/Has your state changed any format, priorities, etc., as result of SCCC activities

Is SCCC being made aware of your state's needs/interests/activities

Process by which your state:

Identifies alternatives to meet its needs

How are materials developed, disseminated, diffused

How is the impact, effect of materials measured, evaluated

Does your state have an advisory group set up to work on diffusion

Do you keep SCCC informed of your needs as SLR

Adequacy of communication within SCCC, among SLRs, between SLRs and Center

How can SCCC communication be improved

Desirability of newsletter/primary objective/target audience/contents/format/schedule

SCCC meetings/pertinence to SCCC matters/disposition of matter of concern/appropriateness/timeliness/as forum for idea exchange, "related information"/examples of activities precipitated/behavior changes

Additional people needed in SCCC network to improve its functioning (state or local level)

State Rep's job a full-time job/Director's job a full-time job/Time required on each

What do State Director, SCCC Director need to do differently to improve their effectiveness

Any problems of discontinuity related to USOE funding procedures/possible movement of Center from place to place/turnover in SCCC personnel/missing meetings

Advantages/disadvantages of one Center location/having Center in various places

How can SCCC best serve V-TECS in your state

If operating ideally, what are most useful changes SCCC can effect

Single most important accomplishment of SCCC under original grant

Adequacy of accomplishment of original grant objectives

Negative aspects of SCCC operation

Type of evaluation most appropriate for SCCC activities /what should it focus on

Adequacy of accomplishment of current grant objectives

TO: Affiliated States of the Southeast
Curriculum Coordination Center
Mississippi State University
Drawer DX
Mississippi State, Miss. 39762

FROM: _____

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS IN PROGRESS

1. Title of materials: _____

2. Type of material: _____
("Type of material" refers to teaching guide, curriculum guide, planning guide, student material, workbooks, evaluation instruments, bibliographies, directories, textbooks, supplementary references, films, filmstrips, transparencies, slides, tapes, pictures, games, posters, records, etc.)

3. Content/Discipline Area: _____
(Language Arts, Mathematics, Sciences, Social Sciences, Fine Arts, Health/Physical Ed., Agricultural/Natural Resources, Business and Office Ed., Home Economics, Trade and Industrial Ed., Vocational Ed. (general), Cooperative Ed., Recreation, Guidance, Technical Ed., Job Placement, Distributive Ed., Career Ed., Industrial Arts, etc.)

4. Intended user: _____
(Students, instructional staff, administrators, supervisors, counselors, parents, local directors, district coordinators, etc.)

5. Occupation level: _____
(Awareness, exploration, preparation, entry, advancement)

6. Grade level: _____
(1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, adult, etc.)

7. Name and address of individual(s) in charge of development: _____

8. Development procedure(s): _____
(author(s), committee, etc.)

9. Validation procedure(s) anticipated: _____
(jury or panel, interim tryout w/students to aid revision, field test of revised versions, etc.)

10. Date started: _____ Anticipated completion date: _____

11. General Description:
(An outline or narrative description which best describes purpose, nature and content of the material. Use back of sheet if needed.)

APPENDIX B - (2)

Identification Number _____
(State) (Number)

Date _____ 19____

ANNOUNCEMENT OF RELEASE OF INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS

1. **Title of materials:** _____

2. **Type of material:** _____
("Type of material" refers to teaching guide, curriculum guide, planning guide, student material, workbooks, evaluation instruments, bibliographies, directories, textbooks, supplementary references, films, filmstrips, transparencies, slides, tapes, pictures, games, posters, records, etc.)

3. **Content/Discipline Area:** _____
(Language Arts, Mathematics, Sciences, Social Sciences, Fine Arts, Health/Physical Ed., Agricultural/Natural Resources, Business and Office Ed., Home Economics, Trade and Industrial Ed., Vocational Ed. (general), Cooperative Ed., Recreation, Guidance, Technical Ed., Job Placement, Distributive Ed., Career Ed., Industrial Arts, etc.)

4. **Intended user:** _____
(Students, instructional staff, administrators, supervisors, counselors, parents, local directors, district coordinators, etc.)

5. **Occupation designed for:** _____
(Awareness, exploration, preparation, entry, advancement)

6. **Grade level:** _____
(1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, adult, etc.)

7. **Development procedures(s):** _____
(Author(s), committee, etc.)

8. **Validation procedure(s) used:** _____
(Jury or panel, interim tryout w/students to aid revision, field test of revised versions, etc.)

9. **Availability:** ☐ For sale at $_____ per unit. ☐ One copy per state available free. ☐ Free in limited numbers. ☐ Not available. ☐ In ERIC System. ☐ Loan copy available. ☐ Microfiche copy available _____ per set.
Source (Name and address): _____

10. **General Description:** _____
(An outline or narrative description which best describes purpose, nature and content of the material. Use back of sheet if needed.)

Please send _____ copy(s) of _____ entitled _____
(State) (Identification No.)

_____

Cost per unit $ _____

( ) Payment of $ _____ is enclosed.
( ) Purchase order is enclosed.

Signed: _____

Ship to:

_____

_____

_____

_____

Invoice to:

_____

_____

_____

_____

(Fold Here)

(Fold Here)

From:

_____

_____

_____

Place Stamp Here

To: _____

_____

_____

_____

(Staple or Tape)